REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the teachings of Park in view of Hoffert.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for transcoding a multimedia presentation for delivery and display wherein the content of the multimedia presentation is analyzed and the transcoding is done based on that analysis. Applicants respectfully assert that neither of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests analyzing the content of a multimedia presentation and then transcoding based on the content analysis.

The Park patent teaches a multiplexing method for multimedia communications to increase error resiliency over the prior art methods in which retransmission had been required to confirm receipt. What Park does is encodes media data, multiplexes the data, places the data in a predetermined frame (payload 130 of Fig. 2A, 170 of Fig. 2B and 230 of Fig. 2C) of the MUX-PDU (the packet shown in Figs. 2A, 2B and 2C), and then adds an extra frame containing a flag of predetermined length and having a bit pattern of "10110010" or another pattern having high auto-correlation (i.e., meaning a pattern which is strongly correlated to itself, and not to the content or to any external

information, see: Col. 2, lines 46-47). The high auto-correlation of the bit pattern in the extra flag increases the probability of the receiver appropriately detecting the MUX-PDU (see: Col. 3, lines 3-5).

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that Park discloses analyzing the multimedia presentation using H.223 protocol unit 110. Nothing in the Park description discusses analysis of the multimedia presentation. The H.223 multiplexing does not require analysis of the presentation and the Park patent does not teach that the H.223 protocol unit analyze the presentation. It simply shows video, audio, and data as separate streams being input to the H.223 protocol unit and a single multiplexed stream being output from the H.223 protocol unit. No presentation analysis is either described or required for the multiplexing.

The Park patent provides details regarding the extra frame and its contents. The Park patent does not, however, provide any details as to any transcoding done by transcoder 120. What Park teaches is multiplexing the multiple media content (i.e., the video, audio and data input to H.223 protocol unit 110), and then having transcoder 120 insert the extra flag for error resiliency. Park does not teach or suggest that the content of the multimedia presentation be analyzed or that the transcoder performs its transcoding based on multimedia presentation content analysis.

In addition, it is clear that Park does ***not*** base its encoding of the extra bit pattern on the multimedia presentation content since Park expressly teaches at Col. 2, lines 46-47 that for the Fig. 2B embodiment "...only the bit pattern of '10110010' may be added as the extra flag 150, or other bit streams having a high auto-correlation...to increase error resiliency." The bit pattern is not related to the content, it is a fixed auto-correlated bit stream. When Park describes Fig. 2C, in which the HDLC flag is converted from an 8-bit to a 16-bit flag in accordance with an alternative embodiment of the invention, it is also clear that the bit pattern is unrelated to the multimedia content. As taught in Col. 2, lines 59 et seq, "..HDLC flag 240 converts an 8-bit flag into a 16-bit flag PN code having auto correlation...". Clearly, therefore, the Examiner cannot maintain that Park teaches or suggests "-performing transcoding based the *(sic)* analyzed content using transcoder 120", as is stated on line 6 of page 3 of the Office Action.

Further, even though the Examiner reaches the conclusion that Park disclosed performing transcoding based on analyzed content (see, again, page 3, line 6), the Examiner then acknowledges that "...Park does not specifically teach analyzing its content". Applicants request clarification of the two conflicting statements. The Examiner cannot conclude that Park discloses performing transcoding based on analyzed content if Park does not teach analyzing the content.

The Examiner further states that "[O]ne skilled in the art would have clearly recognized that the system of Park multiplex the multimedia such that is can be accurately detected (col. 3, lines 1-9)." Applicants respectfully request clarification of that statement. What Park does it add a bit pattern having high auto-correlation so that the transmitted MUX-PDU packet can have a higher probability of detection. Park does not multiplex the multimedia content so that it can be accurately detected, as the Examiner seems to be concluding.

Moreover, even if the Park patent were teaching multiplexing solely for the purpose of detection, such would not be the same as or suggestive of the claimed steps of analyzing the content of a multimedia presentation and then transcoding based on the content analysis. Park does not provide any teachings regarding analysis of multimedia content.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has erred in relying on the Park reference. Clearly the Park patent does not teach the claim features recited in the claims.

Applicants further assert that the Hoffert patent does not provide those teachings which are missing from the Park patent. The Hoffert patent teaches a method and apparatus for searching for media content and for delivering a predetermined portion (i.e., a preview) of the media content for display after it has been retrieved (see: Col. 19, lines 56-63 of the `892 patent).

The delivery of the portion of the media content comprises selecting a predetermined portion (i.e., the preview) and displaying that portion.

The Hoffert patent does not, however, analyze the content of a multimedia presentation and perform transcoding based on the analysis, which is expressly recited in pending independent Claim 1, as well as in Claims 2-24 and 29 which depend from Claim 1, in pending independent Claim 25, as well as in Claim 26 which depends from Claim 26, and in pending independent Claim 27, as well as in Claim 28 which depends from Claim 27.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner as to the effect of combining the teachings of Hoffert and Park. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Hoffert, in the same field of endeavor, teaches analyzing a content of multimedia file *(sic)* wherein the system of Hoffert is to correctly detect and find a desired media file...[t]herefore, it would have been obvious to analyze the content of multimedia file in Park as taught by Hoffert in order to accurately detect and then find a desired multimedia file." Applicants respectfully assert that even if one were motivated to combine the teachings, one would not arrive at the invention as claimed. Hoffert does not analyze a multimedia presentation. Hoffert merely selects the predetermined portion which has been pre-specified for or by the user to use as a preview. Furthermore, even if one used the Hoffert teachings of selecting a predetermined portion of a file,

that would not lead one having skill in the art to analyze the content of the Park multimedia and then perform transcoding based on that content analysis. Modifying Park with Hoffert would result in the Park system selecting a predetermined portion of the incoming stream (for example, selecting one video frame or a few consecutive video frames as the preview) and providing only that predetermined portion to the H.223 protocol unit for multiplexing, followed by adding the extra flag/bit pattern to the multiplexed stream for error resiliency. Clearly the combination would not result in the invention as claimed.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,
John R. Smith, et al

By: Anne Vachon Dougherty
Anne Vachon Dougherty
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 30,374